Staheli is directed to a network environment in which data stored on a primary network server is mirrored on a secondary network server. In case of failure of the primary network server, the secondary network server may be manually configured to serve as a replacement for the failed server. Thus, only one of the primary network server and the secondary network server is in use at any given time (Staheli, Col. 15, line 40).

Thus, any combination of these two references would (at most) yield a system in which the primary and secondary network servers disclosed by Staheli would include peripheral devices (e.g., magnetic disk drive, compact disc drives) which could be automatically configured as primary or secondary devices upon startup, as disclosed by Firooz, but wherein failure of the primary network server would result in a **manual** configuration of the second server as a **replacement**.

Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over any such system resulting from the combination of Staheli and Firooz, because claim 1 requires automatically configuring the second host computer, whereas in the Staheli-Firooz system, the secondary network server must be manually configured upon failure of the primary network server.

In addition, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the combination of Staheli and Firooz because in the Staheli-Firooz system, only one network server is operational at any given time, whereas in claim 1, in response to detecting a decrease in performance, the second host computer is automatically configured to provide **additional computational resources** for the first host computer. Thus, in claim 1 the first and second host computers simultaneously provide computational resources in response to detecting a decrease in performance, whereas in the Staheli-Firooz system, the secondary network server is only operational upon failure of the primary network server.

Claims 2-28 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 2-28 also be withdrawn.

Independent claims 29, 45, and 52 also recite that the second host computer is automatically configured to provide additional computational resources so that the first and second host computers simultaneously provide computational resources. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 29, 45, and 52 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 30-44 depend from claim 29, claims 46-51 depend from claim 45, and claims 53-61 depend from claim 52. Each of these dependent claims is patentable for at least the same

reasons as the independent claim from which it depends. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 30-44, 46-51, and 53-61 be withdrawn.

During the telephone interview of September 8, 2004, the Examiner indicated that he did not have the complete file for the present application available and had only the Office Action, references, and claims. The Examiner asked Applicants to send him a copy of the specification and drawings of the application and scheduled a follow-up telephone interview with Applicants for September 9, 2004. Applicants sent the specification to the Examiner via e-mail on September 8, 2004. A copy of this e-mail is submitted herewith. Additionally, Applicants sent the drawings to the Examiner on September 8, 2004 via facsimile.

During the telephone interview of September 9, 2004, the Examiner indicated that he believed an embodiment of the invention disclosed on page 29-30 distinguished over the prior art and asked Applicants to limit the claims to this embodiment. This embodiment relates to automatically configuring a second host computer to provide resources for a first host computer that uses a different operating system than the second host computer. As shown in Figure 7, a transformation engine is used to transform data used by the first host computer into a format that can be used by the second host computer. While Applicants agree that this embodiment is patentable over the prior art, Applicants believe that the claims as pending also patentably distinguish over the art of record and thus have not amended the claims in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Further, during the telephone interview of September 9, 2004, the Examiner indicated that he was aware of an additional reference that he had not made of record that might be relevant to Applicants' claims. The Examiner indicated that he would provide Applicants with this reference and left Applicants a voice mail shortly after the interview indicating that the reference referred to during the interview is Hashimoto (5,815,668).

Applicants have reviewed Hashimoto and believe that the claims as pending patentably distinguish over this reference. Hashimoto discloses a computer system including a master router and a slave router. The slave router regularly conducts a ping test to a LAN interface of the master router to determine whether the master router is operational. If the master router is not operational, the slave router starts performing routing operations instead of the master router (Hashimoto, Abstract).

As indicated above, independent claims 1, 29, 45, and 52 require that the second host computer is automatically configured to provide additional computational resources so that the

first and second host computers simultaneously provide computational resources. Hashimoto discloses a situation wherein the second router performs routing operation instead of the master router, in case of failure of the master router. Thus, the two routers in Hashimoto do not simultaneously provide computational resources, as required by claims 1, 29, 45, and 52. Thus, each of the independent claims also patentably distinguishes over Hashimoto.

There is simply no prior art of record which teaches the automatic configuration of a second host computer to provide additional computational resources for a first host computer. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that claims 1-61 be allowed.